



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,340	02/17/2004	Daryl B. Olander	ORACL-01402US1	9959
23910	7590	10/02/2008	EXAMINER	
FLIESLER MEYER LLP			LUDWIG, MATTHEW J	
650 CALIFORNIA STREET				
14TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108			2178	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/780,340	OLANDER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	MATTHEW J. LUDWIG	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3-21,23-42 and 44-51 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,3-21,23-42 and 44-51 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/27/07.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the amendment received 3/13/08.
2. Claims 1, 3-21, 23-42, and 44-51 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, 40, 41, and 42 are independent claims.
3. Claims 1-51 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stone have been withdrawn pursuant to applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. **Claims 1, 3-21, 23-42, 44-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hershberg et al. USPN 7,155,705 filed (11/26/2001).**

In reference to independent claim 1 and 11, Hershberg teaches:

'a controller operable to accept the communication and provide the communication to a model'. See column 12, lines 1-67. The reference provides a build tool which is a process that collects the modules for an application and generates instructions and data of the application.

'the model operable to perform processing of the request and to determine a web page to be rendered'. See page 12, lines 1-67. The reference discloses a Java virtual machine within a first application that determines a web page to be rendered.

'the page operable to provide a response based on the request'. See page 12, lines 1-67.

The reference discloses a first application exchanging data with other applications, such as second application using one or more XML documents.

'wherein the web page belongs to a web page group'. See column 12, lines 27-67.

Hershberg discloses a first application that de-marshals the XML document having the states such as employee.dtd which suggests a web page group.

'wherein the web web page is the target of a first action method and wherein the web page raises a second action method; and wherein the second action method implements code that results in website navigation'. See columns 13, lines 1-67 and column 14, lines 1-67. The methods disclosed using Java modules are utilized to marshal and de-marshal data with the exchange format as well as nested Java classes to produce website navigation through employee records.

In reference to dependent claim 3, Hershberg teaches:

The methods disclosed using Java modules are utilized to marshal and de-marshal data with the exchange format as well as nested Java classes to pass data of employee records. See column 13, lines 1-67 and column 14, lines 1-67.

In reference to dependent claim 4 and 5, Hershberg teaches:

Data for configuring the data exchange format is produced. For example the XML DTD statements are produced based on the XML parameter and properties and the associated JAVA statement. See column 14, lines 38-67.

In reference to dependent claim 6, Hershberg teaches:

The techniques herein also are applicable to multiple nested JAVA classes. See column 15, lines 1-56.

In reference to dependent claim 7, Hershberg teaches:

Given instances of these classes where a Department was called “Accounting” and had two employees, the following XML would be produced. See column 15, lines 15-67.

In reference to dependent claim 8, Hershberg teaches:

Binding rules for XML element “Employee”. Line declares that the element will be bound to a class names “Employee” defined in the source file “Employee.java”. See column 13, lines 29-67 and column 14, lines 1-32.

In reference to dependent claim 9, Hershberg teaches:

An application developer inserts tags with configuration information for the exchange format, including exchange format parameters and properties. See column 12, lines 27-67.

In reference to dependent claim 10, Hershberg teaches:

Program modules are generated to marshal and de-marshal data with the exchange format. See page 13, lines 15-67.

In reference to dependent claims 12-20, the claims recite similar features as those found in rejected claims 2-10. Therefore, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

In reference to independent claim 21, Hershberg teaches:

'a controller operable to accept the communication and provide the communication to a model'. See column 12, lines 1-67. The reference provides a build tool which is a process that collects the modules for an application and generates instructions and data of the application.

'the model operable to perform processing of the request and to determine a web page to be rendered'. See page 12, lines 1-67. The reference discloses a Java virtual machine within a first application that determines a web page to be rendered.

'determining a state of the model based on said communication'. Given instances of these classes where a Department was called “Accounting” and had two employees, the following XML would be produced. See column 15, lines 15-67.

'wherein the view is a web page in a web page group' See figure 2. Execute build tool to produce application that exchanges data using XML documents based on DTD. See page 12, lines 1-67. The reference discloses a first application exchanging data with other applications, such as second application using one or more XML documents.

'wherein the web page belongs to a web page group'. See column 12, lines 27-67. Hershberg discloses a first application that de-marshals the XML document having the states such as employee.dtd which suggests a web page group.

'wherein the web web page is the target of a first action method and wherein the web page raises a second action method; and wherein the second action method implements code that results in website navigation'. See columns 13, lines 1-67 and column 14, lines 1-67. The methods disclosed using Java modules are utilized to marshal and de-marshal data with the exchange format as well as nested Java classes to produce website navigation through employee records.

In reference to dependent claims 23-42 and 44-51, the claims recite similar language to the language found in rejected claims 1 and 3-12. Therefore, the claims are rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-21, 23-42, 44-51 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).
Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to MATTHEW J. LUDWIG whose telephone number is (571)272-4127. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen S. Hong/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit
2178

ML